DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 040 SP 006 249

AUTHOR	Marram, Gwen D.; And Others
TITLE	The Impact of Teaming and the Visibility of Teaching on the Professionalism of Elementary School Teachers.
INSTITUTION	Stanford Univ., Calif. Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	SCRDT-TR-33
PUB DATE	72
CONTRACT	OEC-6-10-078(2B)
NOTE	65p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Elementary School Teachers; Evaluation Methods; *Inservice Teacher Education; Open Plan Schools; Participant Satisfaction; *Performance Based Teacher Education; Performance Specifications; *Student Teacher Relationship; *Teacher Evaluation; Team Teaching

ABSTRACT

A major aspect of professionalism is a desire for collegial evaluation. The data presented came from responses to a questionnaire given to 244 teachers in 15 elementary schools. This study showed that elementary school teachers had little respect for evaluations of their teaching by other teachers. The teachers had a low estimation of the value of professional knowledge, skill, and training. There was also a lack of visibility of teachers' work to each other. An increase in the visibility of work, brought about by team teaching and open schools, increased the perceived soundness of evaluations of that work. The visibility of teaching per se had an independent impact on the importance of evaluations and the desired influence of evaluations. Team teaching was also associated with greater collegial control. Among teachers who were members of teams, a higher level of visibility of teacher's work was associated with an increase in the desired influence of and importance accorded evaluation by colleagues. It was suggested that the increased use of open schools and teams may lead to a more professional organization of teaching. Fourteen tables of statistical data are presented. The appendix includes the teacher questionnaire. (Author)

ED 072040

STANFORD CENTER
FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
IN TEACHING

Technical Report No. 33

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE IMPACT OF TEAMING AND THE VISIBILITY OF TEACHING ON THE PROFESSIONALISM OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

Gwen D. Marram, Sanford M. Dornbusch, and
W. Richard Scott

School of Education
Stanford University
Stanford, California

December 1972

Published by the Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, supported in part as a research and development center by funds from the National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of the National Institute of Education. (Contract No. OEC-6-10-078, Component 2B.)

SP 006 249

Introductory Statement

The Center's mission is to improve teaching in American schools. Too many teachers still employ a didactic style aimed at filling passive students with facts. The teacher's environment often prevents him from changing his style, and may indeed drive him out of the profession. And the children of the poor typically suffer from the worst teaching.

The Center uses the resources of the behavioral sciences in pursuing its objectives. Drawing primarily upon psychology and sociology, but also upon other behavioral science disciplines, the Center has formulated programs of research, development, demonstration, and dissemination in three areas. Program 1, Teaching Effectiveness, is developing a Model Teacher Training System that can be used to train both beginning and experienced teachers in effective teaching skills. Program 2, The Environment for Teaching, is developing models of school organization and ways of evaluating teachers that will encourage teachers to become more professional and more committed. Program 3, Teaching Students from Low-Income Areas, is developing materials and procedures for motivating both students and teachers in low-income schools.

This research was conducted in association with studies of evaluation and authority in Program 2 at the Center.

Contents

	Page
List of Tables	iv
Abstract	vi
The Sample	4
Measures of Importance, Soundness, and Influence	5
The Perception of Professional Colleagues	7
Visibility and the Relationship Between Evaluator Influence and Evaluator Importance	8
Sound Evaluations and Importance	10
Visibility of Teaching to Different Evaluators	13
Visibility and Soundness of Evaluations	14
Visibility and the Importance of Evaluations	17
Team Teaching, Visibility, and the Perception of Evaluations	24
References	29
Appendix A: Questionnaire for Teachers	31

List of Tables

Table		Page
1.	Median Values for General Importance, Influence, and Preferred Influence of Different Evaluators	9
2.	Median Values for Perceived Soundness of Different Evaluators' Evaluations, for Teachers in Open and Closed Schools	11
3.	Median Values for Perceived Soundness of Different Evaluators' Evaluations, for Teachers in Open and Closed Schools	12
4.	Median Values for Frequency of Performance Observation by Each Evaluator, for Teachers in Open and Closed Schools	15
5.	Median Values for Frequency of Outcome Observation by Each Evaluator, for Teachers in Open and Closed Schools	16
6.	Relationship Between Perceived Soundness of Principal's Evaluations and Visibility of Work to the Principal, in Gammas	18
7.	Relationship Between Perceived Soundness of Other Teachers' Evaluations and Visibility of Work to Other Teachers, in Gammas	19
8.	Relationship Between Perceived Soundness of Students' Evaluations and Visibility of Work to Students, in Gammas	20
9.	Relationship between Importance of Principal's Evaluations and Visibility of Work to Principal, and Between Importance and Perceived Soundness of Principal's Evaluations, in Gammas	21
10.	Relationship Between Importance of Other Teachers' Evaluations and Visibility of Work to Other Teachers, and Between Importance and Perceived Soundness of Other Teachers' Evaluations, in Gammas	22
11.	Relationship Between Importance of Students' Evaluations and Visibility of Work to Students and Between Importance and Perceived Soundness of Students' Evaluations, in Gammas	23
12.	Median Values for the Importance and Perceived Soundness of Principals' Evaluations in Team and Non-Team Situations, by Task	25

13. Median Values for Importance and Perceived Soundness of Colleagues' Evaluations in Team and Non-Team Situations, by Task 26

14. Median Values for Importance and Perceived Soundness of Students' Evaluations in Team and Non-Team Situations, by Task 27

Abstract

A major aspect of professionalism is a desire for collegial evaluation. This study showed that elementary school teachers had little respect for evaluations of their teaching by other teachers. One reason for this skepticism was the teachers' low estimation of the value of professional knowledge, skill, and training. A second factor, related to the organization of schools, was the lack of visibility of teachers' work to each other. An increase in the visibility of work, brought about by team teaching and open schools, increased the perceived soundness of evaluations of that work, and sound evaluations were important to those being evaluated. The visibility of teaching per se was shown to have an independent impact on the importance of evaluations and the desired influence of evaluations. Team teaching was also associated with greater collegial control. Among teachers who were members of teams, a higher level of visibility of teacher's work was associated with an increase in the desired influence of and importance accorded to evaluation by colleagues. It is suggested that the increased use of open schools and teams may lead to a more professional organization of teaching.

THE IMPACT OF TEAMING AND THE VISIBILITY OF TEACHING ON THE PROFESSIONALISM OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

Gwen D. Marram, Sanford M. Dornbusch,
and W. Richard Scott

The central problem of this study, the impact of work arrangements on collegial control, is of major importance in the contemporary American school. Although our other studies (Magnani, 1970; McCauley, 1971) have shown teachers to be relatively satisfied with school organization as it stands, the public demand for better performance by schools, and by the teachers who are the key participants in schools, forces us to focus on organizational issues. Our program of research is designed to move schools toward situations in which teachers can accept professional criticism within a context of mutual support.

Schools are professional bureaucracies. Their mixed form is a function of the presence within each school of relatively independent professionals, the teachers, and the representative of a hierarchical structure, the principal. We have shown elsewhere that teachers have a high degree of autonomy and freedom with respect to their teaching tasks (McCauley et al., 1972). With this autonomy and freedom should come the emphasis on collegial evaluation that is characteristic of professional groups. The teaching profession has failed to develop such a system of self-regulation and therefore does not encourage criticism and cooperation among teachers or between teachers and their superiors.

Gwen D. Marram is Acting Chairman, Department of Nursing, California State University, San Jose. Sanford M. Dornbusch is Professor of Sociology at Stanford University and a Research and Development Associate of the Center. W. Richard Scott is Chairman of the Department of Sociology at Stanford and a Research and Development Associate of the Center. The authors are indebted to their colleagues, Elizabeth G. Cohen and John W. Meyer, whose earlier study of team teaching suggested the importance of visibility to them. Dr. June Thompson, Dr. Brian L. McCauley, Freda F. Elsenson, and Sandra Smith assisted in the development of the questionnaire. Leora Herrmann and Suzanne Ayala helped write this report.

The absence of such an evaluation system seems to derive from the lack of faith teachers have in one another, and perhaps in themselves. Many of the attempts to reorganize public schools are based on an image of teachers as desiring collegial relationships, eager to share their knowledge and experience with one another, and open to their colleagues' suggestions. In reality, however, teachers prove unwilling to raise the existing level of collegial relationships. Indeed, teachers are skeptical of the quality of their fellow teachers' evaluations of teaching performance. Proposals for increased evaluation of teachers founder upon the reluctance of teachers to be evaluated by each other.

This study attempts to go beyond a mere description of the problem by pointing to two sources of the lack of confidence in collegial evaluation. The first is that teachers believe good teaching to be primarily dependent not on training or experience, though the latter is considered more important than the former, but on personality. Our research is not directed toward this problem, although we believe it is one that must be faced by teacher-training institutions.

The second basis for skepticism toward collegial evaluation, and the one with which we are primarily concerned, is the relative lack of visibility of the teacher's performance. We will show that teachers whose work is more visible to their colleagues are more willing to be judged by those colleagues. This is probably a direct result of the strong correlation between the visibility of a performance and the perception of an evaluation of that performance as sound. Happily, teachers and administrators in existing school systems are increasingly willing to modify work arrangements in ways that increase the visibility of teaching and thereby increase the utility of evaluation by professional colleagues.

Our research on the effect of visibility has produced clear and powerful findings. The attractive simplicity of these findings may lead to over-enthusiastic application. We have not randomly assigned teachers to situations of high and low visibility and then found differences in the perceived soundness of evaluations by colleagues. Rather, we have employed a correlational approach, which can be affected

by self-selection of teachers. But this study is based upon an existing theory of evaluation in organizations (Dornbusch and Scott, in press). The results of our empirical studies of nurses (Marram, 1971) and other groups (Dornbusch and Scott, in press) are encouraging, mutually supportive, and potentially important for development.

In our theory, soundly based evaluations are evaluations whose level is a function of the quality of the evaluatee's performance. They have greater importance for the person being evaluated for two relatively distinct reasons. First, since participants in organizations depend on evaluations to influence the flow of professional rewards and penalties, soundly based evaluations provide the performer with greater control of the reward process. Because such evaluations are, by definition, highly correlated with the quality of the performance, they provide performers with an incentive to alter their evaluations by altering their performance, in the relative certainty that improved performance will produce higher evaluations, increased rewards, and lesser penalties.

The second motive for giving greater importance to soundly based evaluations is personal rather than organizational. Every human being is affected by other people's evaluations of him. Much of what we think of ourselves reflects the responses that others give us. Although that reflection may be considerably distorted, it has been shown that a person's self-concept is influenced by the responses of others (Miyamoto and Dornbusch, 1956; Secord and Backman, 1964). The more soundly based an evaluation is, the greater its impact on our self-concept. High evaluations may seem desirable per se, but we all have difficulty internalizing high evaluations that we believe are based on flattery or unrepresentative samples of our behavior.

In short, soundly based evaluations give performers greater eventual control over rewards and penalties, and incidentally, a more reliable basis for their own conception of themselves. Within the school context, as we will see shortly, highly visible teaching is associated with perceptions that evaluations of teaching, particularly by colleagues, are soundly based. Thus, increasing the visibility of teaching can have a major impact on teachers and schools.

The Sample

The data presented in this paper come from responses to a detailed questionnaire (Appendix A) given to 244 teachers in fifteen elementary schools in a large public school district. Every credentialed full-time teacher in the fifteen schools was asked to participate; approximately five percent of the teachers did not respond. Contact with teachers was facilitated by school administrators, who arranged meetings at noon or after school and encouraged teachers to answer the questionnaire. A member of the research team then administered the questionnaire to the entire group. It is likely that the twelve teachers who did not participate differed in important ways from those who did, but these few non-participants could not have affected the major findings of our study.

In selecting the district and schools to be studied we sought variation in the organization of work, particularly variation in the visibility of teaching performance. Team teaching, particularly in open schools, would presumably have a significant effect on the visibility of the teacher's performance to his or her peers. We therefore included in our sample four schools that were of open architectural design and used team teaching almost exclusively, six that had only walled-off classrooms and no team teaching, and five schools that used both individual and team teaching and were of mixed architectural design. In all, 56 teachers worked in team-teaching situations in open schools, 106 worked in non-team-teaching situations in walled-off classrooms, and 82 were in mixed schools.

The sample chosen for this study is not representative of open and closed schools in the United States, but it is appropriate for testing our hypotheses about the effect of visibility on the perceived importance and soundness of peer evaluation among elementary school teachers. It provides one of the first opportunities to obtain systematic data on these performers' attitudes toward various evaluators and the impact of team teaching upon the teachers' perception of the evaluation process.

We defined and studied four of the many tasks involved in teaching. They were:

(1) Teaching Subject Matter: Including, for example, leading and participating in discussions; preparing lesson plans; stimulating student interest in learning; lecturing; acting as a guide and/or facilitator in student learning activities; examining and grading students on their knowledge of subject matter.

(2) Teaching and/or stimulating citizenship, socialization, and character development (abbreviated as Character Development): Including, for example, social skills; guiding the student toward or providing for an environment where student and staff understanding of themselves and each other can develop; manners; morality; helping the individual develop his full potential; interpersonal relations.

(3) Maintaining Control: Including, for example, preventing interference with other classes; keeping down the noise level; helping students find ways of achieving individual freedom without placing restrictions on the freedom of others; keeping the attention of the class on their work; helping students work out for themselves the consequences of their actions for others.

(4) Record Keeping: Including, for example, reporting absences and/or late-comers; maintaining administrative records; turning in grades accurately and on time; fulfilling record keeping tasks required by state laws; taking attendance; setting up a system that attempts to measure the growth of student potential.

By dividing the task of teachers into these four major areas, we were able to produce generally understood and meaningful divisions of the complex role of the teacher.

Measures of Importance, Soundness, and Influence

We asked each teacher a series of questions on the importance of evaluations by other persons, the soundness of those evaluations, the influence of evaluations on the rewards and penalties distributed within the school organization, and the influence they would prefer evaluators to have. To measure importance we asked,

> How important to you are the evaluations of each of the following persons?

The positions enumerated were: superintendent or assistant superintendent, principal or assistant principal, individual teachers, members of your teaching team, the faculty of your school, teachers of the same subject or grade in other schools, volunteer aides, parents, and students. In studying the evaluations of each of the four teaching tasks, we asked only about the importance of evaluations by the principal, other teachers, and students. This made it possible to compare both the relative importance of numerous evaluators in general and the relative importance of three key groups of evaluators for each task.

The scale for importance was "extremely important; very important; moderately important; slightly important;" and "not at all important." "Extremely important" was given a score of 1, and "not at all important" a score of 5. The same basic scale was used for measures of importance, influence, preferred influence, and soundness; that is, we used a five-point scale ranging from "extremely" as 1 to "not at all" as 5, changing only the modifying adjective.

It was vital that teachers understood "evaluation" meant not just formal written evaluations, but any communicated evaluation. The introductory statement preceding the questionnaire therefore read:

> Now we want to ask you some questions about how often you receive ratings or evaluations: for example, an evaluator may compliment you on your good work each day or criticize you for mistakes; you may occasionally receive formal written evaluations; an evaluator may simply indicate his judgments of your performance with a smile or frown; an evaluator may look at how you are doing and say nothing, yet you may know whether he is satisfied.
>
> In general, when you learn in any way, directly or indirectly, how well or poorly an evaluator thinks you are doing on a task, you are receiving an evaluation. Please remember that what we mean by evaluations means much more than formal written evaluations.

The questions about importance were preceded by the following observation:

> You may care very much about evaluations from some persons, while the evaluations of others, for various reasons, may not be important to you. How important to you are the evaluations of the following persons?

The questions about influence required more groundwork, notably a clear definition of organizational rewards and penalties.

> There may be many people who occasionally evaluate how well or poorly you are doing on these tasks. Although many people may judge your work, perhaps not all of them have influence on your organizational rewards and penalties.
>
> The term, organizational rewards and penalties, includes many things: for example, class assignments; room assignments; pay for extra services; tenure; scheduling preferences; salary; assignment of assistants; leaves of absence; access to equipment; being retained in service of the school; etc.

We would then ask:

> How much influence does each of the persons listed below have on your organizational rewards and penalties?

The positions enumerated were the same as were listed for the general question on importance. Task-specific questions about influence were omitted because respondents tend to see the influence of evaluators on their organizational rewards and penalties as global, and cannot extricate that portion attributable to performance of any particular task. We also asked:

> How much influence should each of the persons listed below have on your organizational rewards and penalties?

This provided us with a measure of preferred influence.

The Perception of Professional Colleagues

The failure of professionalism among teachers, i.e. their resistance to collegial evaluation, is due first of all to the teachers' lack of faith in the competence of their colleagues. Teachers did not believe that teaching involves technical mastery of a body of knowledge; they regarded experience as more helpful in their work than training, and personality as most helpful of all. Only 39 percent of the teachers

rated their training as extremely or very helpful in doing their work. By contrast, 85 percent of nurses questioned (Marram, 1971) rated their training as extremely or very helpful. When asked whether personality was more important than knowledge or skill in determining success in their vocation, 74 percent of the teachers agreed that it was; among nurses, by contrast, only 42 percent agreed with a similar statement. We thus have as the first basis for the perceived low soundness and importance of evaluations by other teachers, the teachers' lack of faith in the training, knowledge, or skills of their teacher colleagues.

Visibility and the Relationship Between Evaluator Influence and Evaluator Importance

Analysis of the nine positions for which teachers stated their perception of the importance, influence, and preferred influence of each evaluator, showed a relationship between those variables (Table 1). In our theory, influence tends to lead to importance, for control over the rewards and penalties of the organization makes an evaluator subjectively important to the evaluatee. If we use gamma, a non-parametric measure ranging from -1.0 to +1.0, to measure the strength of the qualitative relationship for dichotomized measures (Anderson and Zelditch, 1968), we find that for teachers the gamma for the relationship between perceived importance and perceived influence was .74; that is, the gamma was .74 when one dichotomizes the teachers' perceptions of the importance and influence of others. The relationship between importance and preferred influence was about the same, .62. There was, in short, relatively high agreement in the ranking of an evaluator's importance, influence, and preferred influence for the nine positions.

It is the exception to this relationship which is interesting, for it seems to suggest another basis for importance--the visibility of a teacher's work to an evaluator. The superintendent was the only person who seemed to be high in influence but relatively low in importance. As in our study of hospital nurses (Marram, 1971), where the director of nursing had a similar anomalous position, evaluators who were remote from the working situation and saw less of the performer at work were less

TABLE 1

Median Values for General Importance, Influence, and Preferred Influence of Different Evaluators

	Importance	Rank of Importance	Influence	Rank of Influence	Preferred Influence	Rank of Preferred Influence
Superintendent or Assistant Superintendent	3.1 (N = 206)	8.5	3.1 (N = 221)	2.5	3.0 (N = 238)	3.5
Principal or Assistant Principal	1.8 (N = 243)	3	1.7 (N = 240)	1	1.9 (N = 240)	1
Individual Teachers	2.6 (N = 241)	5	3.8 (N = 232)	7	3.6 (N = 234)	7
Members of your Teaching Team	1.7 (N = 148)	2	3.1 (N = 143)	2.5	2.6 (N = 151)	2
The Faculty of your School	2.8 (N = 241)	6	3.7 (N = 229)	6	3.4 (N = 235)	5
Teachers of the same Subject or Grade, Other Schools	2.9 (N = 236)	7	3.9 (N = 216)	8	3.7 (N = 228)	8
Volunteer Aides	3.1 (N = 211)	8.5	4.5 (N = 178)	9	4.5 (N = 221)	9
Parents	2.0 (N = 242)	4	3.5 (N = 229)	5	3.5 (N = 234)	6
Students	1.5 (N = 243)	1	3.4 (N = 223)	4	3.0 (N = 230)	3.5

Note: Scale for each measure used (1) extremely, (2) very, (3) moderately, (4) slightly, and (5) not at all.

important to the evaluatee. This finding suggests that the visibility of their work has a strong impact on the performers' attitude toward an evaluator.

The impact of visibility can also be seen in Table 1 if one looks at the importance and preferred influence of members of teaching teams. The greatest difference between preferred and actual influence was found for "members of your teaching team." Teachers saw the other members of their team as more important than other faculty, and were more willing to increase the influence of team members than that of any other group.

Sound Evaluations and Importance

The visibility of work has a direct relationship to the soundness of an evaluation; soundness, in turn, has a direct bearing on the perceived importance of an evaluation. Soundly based evaluations, like influential evaluations, are more important to the person being evaluated. The direction of causation might conceivably be from increased importance to increased soundness, since the persons being evaluated are capable of changing their perceptions of the soundness of evaluations to match their importance. But our theory explicitly predicts that it is the greater soundness of an evaluation which leads to an increase in its perceived importance.

Tables 2 and 3 show that the teachers in closed schools considered evaluations by other teachers lower in importance and soundness than evaluations by either students or principal. Evaluations considered high in soundness were also generally high in importance. The gammas for this relationship between importance and soundness for the expanded list of nine evaluators for each task were all positive, ranging from .33 to 1.00. Limiting ourselves to the three evaluators singled out for special attention (principal, peers, and students), teachers in closed schools noticeably considered evaluation by other teachers low in soundness, violating one of the key tenets of professionalism. The evaluations of the principal were, in general, considered most

TABLE 2

Median Values for Perceived Soundness of
Different Evaluators' Evaluations, for Teachers
in Open and Closed Schools
(Open N=55-56, Closed N=105-106)

	Teaching Subject Matter		Character Development		Maintaining Control		Record Keeping	
	Open	Closed	Open	Closed	Open	Closed	Open	Closed
Principal	2.6	2.7	2.6	2.5	2.7	2.5	2.7	2.6
Other Teachers	2.7	3.1	2.7	3.2	2.5	3.1	2.7	3.2
Students	2.6	2.8	2.6	2.9	2.6	2.8	3.0	3.4

Note: Scale for soundness used (1) extremely, (2) very, (3) moderately, (4) slightly, and (5) not at all sound.

TABLE 3

Median Values for Perceived Importance of Different Evaluators' Evaluations, for Teachers in Open and Closed Schools (Open N=56, Closed N=106)

	Teaching Subject Matter		Character Development		Maintaining Control		Record Keeping	
	Open	Closed	Open	Closed	Open	Closed	Open	Closed
Principal	1.8	2.0	1.7	1.9	1.9	2.1	2.6	3.3
Other Teachers	2.3	2.7	2.2	2.8	2.3	2.9	3.2	3.8
Students	1.0	1.8	1.1	1.7	1.6	2.0	2.1	3.4

Note: Scale for importance used (1) extremely, (2) very, (3) moderately, (4) slightly, and (5) not at all important.

soundly based. This is less surprising than the fact that other teachers' evaluations were considered less sound than evaluations of students. In general, principals, the highest evaluators in influence, and students seemed to share the same high level of importance, while other teachers' evaluations were considered less important to teachers. In the closed schools the evaluations of other teachers were considered both less important and less soundly based than those of other major evaluators.

The viewpoint of teachers in open schools, as presented in Tables 2 and 3, was markedly different. Teachers in open schools believed evaluations by other teachers to be more soundly based than did teachers in closed schools. The greatest differences in perceived soundness between teachers in open and closed schools were in the perceived soundness of other teachers' evaluations. For the importance of evaluations in open schools, the results were less clear-cut. Although teachers in open schools considered evaluations by other teachers more important on the average than did teachers in closed schools, there was a general increase in the importance of all evaluators for teachers in open schools--other teachers, the principal, and the students. There seems to be increased sensitivity in open schools to evaluations by any of the three major evaluators. This is not implausible; importance, after all, is not a fixed sum. Increased importance for one person's evaluations does not necessarily imply diminished importance for another's.

The differences between open and closed schools lead us to a closer examination of the impact of the visibility of teaching on the perception of evaluations.

Visibility of Teaching to Different Evaluators

We have already discussed our proposition that higher visibility of work makes evaluations seem more soundly based and more important. Four kinds of questions were asked to measure the visibility of work to evaluators: the frequency with which an evaluator observed the performance, the proportion of all performances observed, the frequency with which an outcome was observed, and the proportion of all outcomes observed.

Our results showed little difference among the four measures. Frequency of visibility and proportion of visibility were highly correlated, as were visibility of outcome and performance. For example, teachers in closed schools believed that for all teaching tasks, students saw work performances more frequently than other teachers or the principal. In general, principals in a closed schools were believed to see a teacher's performance more frequently than did other teachers, but less frequently than did students (Table 4). The same pattern existed with respect to the frequency of outcomes observed (Table 5). For teachers in closed schools, therefore, students clearly ranked first in visibility, principals second, and other teachers third.

Examination of Tables 4 and 5 for teachers in open schools shows higher visibility of performances and outcomes. In closed schools, other teachers were seen as far less frequently observing either performances or outcomes than in open schools. While teachers in closed schools were believed to see less of the teacher's work than did either principals or students, in open schools teachers were second only to students in the frequency with which they were believed to observe performances and outcomes. The open schools exposed more of a teacher's work; the increased visibility of other teachers in no sense reflected a reduction of the visibility of the teacher's work to either students or the principal. These differences in visibility had a noticeable impact on the perception of the soundness and importance of evaluations by various evaluators.

Visibility and Soundness of Evaluations

We noted earlier that, on the average, higher levels of visibility in open schools were found in conjunction with a higher level of perceived soundness of evaluations. At this point, we turn to individual variation in visibility and perceived soundness, thereby measuring for our entire sample the strength and direction of this relationship.

TABLE 4

Median Values for Frequency of Performance Observation
by Each Evaluator, for Teachers in Open and Closed Schools

(Open N=56, Closed N=105-106)

	Teaching Subject Matter		Character Development		Maintaining Control		Record Keeping	
	Open	Closed	Open	Closed	Open	Closed	Open	Closed
Principal	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.4	3.6	4.2	4.2
Other Teachers	3.4	4.8	3.6	4.3	3.1	4.0	3.9	5.2
Students	2.0	2.4	2.2	2.9	2.0	2.4	3.1	4.1

Note: Scale for frequency used (1) very frequently, (2) frequently, (3) fairly often, (4) occasionally, (5) seldom, (6) almost never, and (7) never.

TABLE 5

Median Values for Frequency of Outcome Observation by Each Evaluator, for Teachers in Open and Closed Schools

(Open N=56, Closed N=105-106)

	Teaching Subject Matter		Character Development		Maintaining Control		Record Keeping	
	Open	Closed	Open	Closed	Open	Closed	Open	Closed
Principal	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.1	3.9	4.0
Other Teachers	3.3	4.0	3.0	3.9	2.8	3.8	3.7	5.1
Students	2.3	2.5	2.6	3.1	2.2	2.4	3.6	3.9

Note: Scale for frequency used (1) very frequently, (2) frequently, (3) fairly often, (4) occasionally, (5) seldom, (6) almost never, and (7) never.

First, it will be seen from Tables 6, 7, and 8 that those teachers who believed others saw more of their work were far more likely to see those others as sound in their evaluations. In separate analyses for principals (Table 6), other teachers (Table 7), and students (Table 8), the gammas showed extremely high positive relationships between perceptions of increased visibility and perceptions of increased soundness. Teachers who reported that an evaluator saw their work often were far more likely to believe that the evaluations were soundly based. Every one of the gammas was high and positive, and significantly rejects the null hypothesis. Computing the relationship between visibility and soundness for each task and each of the measures of visibility gave similar positive gammas. Clearly, teachers believed that those superiors, peers, or clients who saw more of the performances or outcomes of their work were more likely to make sound evaluations. This lends some support to the emphasis by Glass (1972) on observation of teacher performances as the best current basis for evaluation.

Visibility and the Importance of Evaluations

We predicted that higher visibility for a given evaluator would make his evaluations not only sounder, but also more important in the eyes of the recipient. Within each evaluator group, therefore, we computed the relationship between the visibility of the teacher's work and the perceived importance of evaluations. The results are shown in Table 9, where the evaluator is the principal; Table 10, where the evaluators are other teachers; and Table 11, where the evaluators are students. The last row in each of these tables shows the predicted positive relationship between the perceived soundness of an evaluation and its importance to the recipient. To summarize, Tables 6 through 11 show that visibility increases the perceived soundness of evaluations, and that higher levels of perceived soundness lead to higher levels of importance of evaluations.

TABLE 6

Relationship Between Perceived Soundness of Principal's Evaluations and Visibility of Work to the Principal, in Gammas (N = 242 - 243)

	Perceived Soundness of Principal's Evaluations			
	Teaching Subject Matter	Character Development	Maintaining Control	Record Keeping
Frequency Principal Sees Performance	.76***	.78***	.76***	.52***
Proportion of Performance Principal Sees	.82***	.79***	.71***	.50***
Frequency Principal Sees Outcome	.60***	.70***	.64***	.61***
Proportion of Outcome Principal Sees	.74***	.75***	.74***	.67***

***Rejects the null hypothesis at .001 level.

TABLE 7

Relationship Between Perceived Soundness of Other Teachers' Evaluations and Visibility of Work to Other Teachers, in Gammas (N = 242)

	Perceived Soundness of Other Teachers' Evaluations			
	Teaching Subject Matter	Character Development	Maintaining Control	Record Keeping
Frequency Other Teachers See Performance	.62***	.77***	.78***	.70***
Proportion of Performance Other Teachers See	.54***	.58***	.49***	.40**
Frequency Other Teachers See Outcome	.46***	.65***	.62***	.46***
Proportion of Outcome Other Teachers See	.58***	.71***	.63***	.35*

Rejects the null hypothesis at: *** .001 level
** .01 level
* .05 level

TABLE 8

Relationship Between Perceived Soundness of Students' Evaluations and Visibility of Work to Students, in Gammas (N = 244)

	Perceived Soundness of Students' Evaluations			
	Teaching Subject Matter	Character Development	Maintaining Control	Record Keeping
Frequency Students See Performance	.62***	.57***	.63***	.83***
Proportion of Performance Students See	.52**	.57***	.62***	.73***
Frequency Students See Outcome	.66***	.74***	.74***	.86***
Proportion of Outcome Students See	.46**	.65***	.62***	.65***

Rejects the null hypothesis at: *** .001 level
** .01 level

TABLE 9

Relationship Between Importance of Principal's Evaluations and Visibility of Work to Principal, and Between Importance and Perceived Soundness of Principal's Evaluations, in Gammas (N = 244)

	Importance of Principal's Evaluations			
	Teaching Subject Matter	Character Development	Maintaining Control	Record Keeping
Frequency Principal Sees Performance	.19	.55***	.39**	.63***
Proportion of Performance Principal Sees	.34*	.44***	.43**	.36**
Frequency Principal Sees Outcome	.30*	.58***	.45***	.58***
Proportion of Outcome Principal Sees	.23	.45**	.49***	.48***
Soundness of Principal's Evaluations	.27	.69***	.45**	.53***

Rejects the null hypothesis at: *** .001 level
** .01 level
* .05 level

TABLE 10

Relationship Between Importance of Other Teachers' Evaluations and Visibility of Work to Other Teachers, and Between Importance and Perceived Soundness of Other Teachers' Evaluations, in Gammas (N = 243)

	Importance of Other Teachers' Evaluations			
	Teaching Subject Matter	Character Development	Maintaining Control	Record Keeping
Frequency Other Teachers See Performance	.41**	.48***	.50***	.50***
Proportion of Performance Other Teachers See	.31*	.43**	.40**	.38**
Frequency Other Teachers See Outcome	.46***	.50***	.40**	.49***
Proportion of Outcome Others Teachers See	.55***	.57***	.53***	.47***
Soundness of Other Teachers' Evaluations	.48***	.67***	.52***	.47***

Rejects the null hypothesis at: *** .001 level
** .01 level
* .05 level

TABLE II

Relationship Between Importance of Students' Evaluations
and Visibility of Work to Students and Between
Importance and Perceived Soundness of Students' Evaluations, in Gammas
(N = 244)

	Importance of Students' Evaluations			
	Teaching Subject Matter	Character Development	Maintaining Control	Record Keeping
Frequency Students See Performance	.35*	.31	.44**	.42**
Proportion of Performance Students See	.23	.24	.07	.60***
Frequency Students See Outcome	.27	.34*	.31*	.48***
Proportion of Outcome Students See	.32*	.34*	.23	.47***
Soundness of Students' Evaluations	.76***	.82***	.67***	.43**

Rejects the null hypothesis at: *** .001 level
** .01 level
* .05 level

Team Teaching, Visibility, and the Perception of Evaluations

Team teaching is most readily defined as teaching that "involves the association of two or more teachers who have joint responsibility for the education of a fairly large group of students" (Hillson, 1965). We separated three dimensions often associated with the concept of teaming: cooperation, coordination, and visibility of teachers to one another. The three dimensions were measured by the responses: (a) "I work cooperatively with other teachers in instructing and in scheduling activities," for cooperation; (b) "I meet regularly with a group of teachers to plan instructional activities," for coordination; and (c) "We can see and hear each other as we perform our teaching task," for visibility. This made it possible to separate the impact of visibility on the perceived soundness and importance of evaluations within teams.

The first row of Table 12 records the median importance and soundness of principals' evaluations for teachers not on teams (neither coordinates nor cooperates); the second row has the same data for team teachers (either coordinates or cooperates or both); the third and fourth rows subdivide the team teachers into those whose work is not visible to other teachers and those whose work is visible to other teachers. Tables 13 and 14 are organized in the same way, with other teachers' evaluations analyzed in Table 13, and students' evaluations in Table 14.

For other teachers as evaluators, the focus of this monograph, Table 13 shows that teaming increased both the perceived soundness and the importance of evaluations. The basis for this consistent result for the four teaching tasks is shown by comparison of teams where work was visible and teams where work was not visible. Teachers on teams with visibility consistently rated other team members higher in perceived soundness and importance of evaluations. For principals, there was a tendency in the same direction, while for students as evaluators, no patterned results emerged. Since we defined visibility of team teaching in terms of visibility to other teachers, the relationship of visibility to perceived soundness and importance is again confirmed.

TABLE 12

Median Values for the Importance and Perceived Soundness of Principals' Evaluations in Team and Non-Team Situations, by Task

	Principals' Evaluations							
	Teaching Subject Matter		Character Development		Maintaining Control		Record Keeping	
	Importance	Soundness	Importance	Soundness	Importance	Soundness	Importance	Soundness
1) No Team, Neither Coordinates Nor Cooperates (N = 124-25)	1.9	2.6	1.9	2.4	2.0	2.4	3.0	2.7
2) Team, Either Coordinates or Cooperates or Both (N = 118-19)	1.6	2.6	1.6	2.5	1.9	2.5	2.9	2.5
2A) Team, No Visibility (N = 49)	2.0	3.0	2.1	3.0	2.2	2.9	2.9	2.9
2B) Team, With Visibility (N = 69-70)	1.7	2.3	1.6	2.2	1.8	2.2	2.6	2.2

Note: Scale for frequency used (1) very frequently, (2) frequently, (3) fairly often, (4) occasionally, (5) seldom, (6) almost never, and (7) never.

TABLE 13

Median Values for Importance and Perceived Soundness of Colleagues' Evaluations in Team and Non-Team Situations, by Task

	Colleagues' Evaluations							
	Teaching Subject Matter		Character Development		Maintaining Control		Record Keeping	
	Importance	Soundness	Importance	Soundness	Importance	Soundness	Importance	Soundness
1) No Team, Neither Coordinates nor Cooperates (N = 123-25)	2.7	3.2	2.7	3.1	2.8	3.1	3.5	3.3
2) Team, Either Coordinates or Cooperates or Both (N = 119)	2.5	2.9	2.5	2.9	2.6	2.9	3.4	3.0
2A) Team, No Visibility (N = 49)	2.7	3.0	2.7	3.1	2.8	3.1	3.6	3.2
2B) Team, With Visibility (N = 70)	2.3	2.8	2.3	2.7	2.4	2.7	3.4	2.8

Note: Scale for frequency used (1) very frequently, (2) frequently, (3) fairly often, (4) occasionally, (5) seldom, (6) almost never, and (7) never.

TABLE 14

Median Values for Importance and Perceived Soundness of Students' Evaluations in Team and Non-Team Situations, by Task

	Students' Evaluations							
	Teaching Subject Matter		Character Development		Maintaining Control		Record Keeping	
	Importance	Soundness	Importance	Soundness	Importance	Soundness	Importance	Soundness
1) No Team, Neither Coordinates Nor Cooperates (N = 125)	1.9	2.9	1.8	3.0	2.0	2.9	3.3	3.3
2) Team, Either Coordinates or Cooperates or Both (N = 119)	1.8	2.7	1.8	2.8	2.0	2.6	2.8	3.0
2A) Team, No Visibility (N = 49)	1.5	2.8	1.6	2.9	1.7	2.8	2.9	3.1
2B) Team, With Visibility (N = 70)	1.7	2.6	1.6	2.7	1.9	2.5	3.0	3.0

Note: Scale for frequency was (1) very frequently, (2) frequently, (3) fairly often, (4) occasionally, (5) seldom, (6) almost never, and (7) never.

The foregoing discussion of visibility has important implications for school architecture and school organization. Open school buildings increase the likelihood of team teaching and increased visibility among teachers. When our first studies of teaching began in 1968, Dr. Robert N. Bush, Director of the Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, observed that open schools would prove a key to the environment of future school systems--an insight confirmed by our findings on the impact of visibility. Many of the changes in the organization of teaching prompted by open schools have been ad hoc, and their possible effects not fully evaluated. The strong relationships to visibility we have observed in open and closed schools suggest that the open school may have an important impact on visibility and, thereby, on the professionalism of teachers and the quality of teaching.

References

Anderson, T., & Zelditch, M. A Basic Course in Statistics with Sociological Applications. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968.

Dornbusch, S. M., & Scott, W. R. Evaluation and Authority. New York: McGraw-Hill, forthcoming.

Glass, G. V. "Statistical and Measurement Problems in Implementing the Stull Act," in Papers Presented at the Conference on the Stull Act, Stanford University, October 12-14, 1972. Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1972.

Hillson, M. (Ed.) Change and Innovation in Elementary School Organization. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1965.

McCauley, B. L., Dornbusch, S. M., & Scott, W. R. Evaluation and Authority in Alternative Schools and Public Schools. Technical Report 23. Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, Stanford University, 1972.

Magnani, L. "Task Conception and Propriety of Autonomy." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Stanford University, 1970.

Marram, G. D. "Visibility of Work and the Evaluation Process: Evaluation and Authority for Nurses in Hospitals and Teachers in Open and Closed Schools." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Stanford University, 1971.

Miyamoto, S. F., & Dornbusch, S. M. "A Test of the Interactionist Hypothesis of Self-Concept," American Journal of Sociology, 61 (1956), 399-403.

Secord, P. F., & Backman, C. W. Social Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Appendix A

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

This anonymous questionnaire is designed to provide information about the attitudes of teachers. A research team from Stanford University, supported by the Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, is administering this questionnaire and analyzing the results. After the research has been completed, your school district will receive a complete report of the results. In addition to gathering general knowledge about the organization of schools, the research team is seeking through this study to develop more successful educational organizations.

No individual or group will be identifiable in our report. The completeness and accuracy of your responses, however, will aid the research team by making it possible for them to form an accurate idea of your attitudes about the school in which you teach and the people with whom you associate.

While filling out the questionnaire, please keep two things in mind. First, although you may perform some administrative duties, please respond to the questionnaire in your role as a teacher. Second, when you are not sure how to answer a question, please feel free to give your best judgment or guess. Only if you have absolutely no idea on what basis to form a judgment or guess should you write in, "Don't know."

Unless you have a specific question, please turn the page and begin the questionnaire.

We will begin with a few background questions. Please check the appropriate spaces.

1. Sex: Male _____ Female _____

2. Age: _____

3. What is the name of the school in which you are now teaching?_____

4. Counting the present year, what is the total number of years of teaching experience you have had? (Please check only one.)
   a. _____ Less than one year
   b. _____ More than one year, but less than two years
   c. _____ Two to four years
   d. _____ Four to six years
   e. _____ Seven to nine years
   f. _____ Ten to twelve years
   g. _____ Thirteen to fifteen years
   h. _____ Sixteen or more years

5. In approximately what grade are most of the children you teach this year?
   a. _____ Kindergarten
   b. _____ First grade
   c. _____ Second grade
   d. _____ Third grade
   e. _____ Fourth grade
   f. _____ Fifth grade
   g. _____ Sixth grade
   h. _____ Other (Please write in):_____

6. If you are teaching mainly one or two subjects, what are these subjects?

   _____

7. For how many years have you taught this (these) subject (s)?
   a. _____ Less than one year
   b. _____ More than one year, but less than two years
   c. _____ Two to four years
   d. _____ Four to six years
   e. _____ Seven to nine years
   f. _____ Ten to twelve years
   g. _____ Thirteen to fifteen years
   h. _____ Sixteen or more years

8. What is your employment status in this school or school system? (Piease check the appropriate space after each letter.)

a. _____ Full time; _____ Part time

b. _____ Tenure; _____ Non-tenure; _____ Not applicable in this school

c. _____ Paid; _____ Unpaid volunteer

9. Are you involved in a team teaching approach to instruction with students?

a. _____ Yes, always or almost always

b. _____ Yes, most of the time

c. _____ Yes, occasionally

d. _____ No, never or almost never

9a. If you are involved in any kind of team teaching approach, check all statements that apply to your situation:

a. _____ I work cooperatively with other teachers in instructing students and in scheduling activities.

b. _____ We can see and hear each other as we perform our teaching tasks.

c. _____ I meet regularly with a group of teachers to plan instructional activities.

d. _____ I am primarily responsible for one group of students, but that same group of students regularly meets with other teachers for some of their instruction.

e. _____ I am not responsible for any specific group of students, but responsibility for all students is shared by teachers on the team.

10. If you are a member of a team, how many other persons are on your team?

Number of credentialed teachers _____

Number of student or intern teachers _____

Number of teacher aides: Students _____
Parents _____

Number of intern aides: Students _____
Parents _____

Number of curriculum specialists _____

Other: Title _____ Number _____

11. What is the highest degree you hold? (If you hold a degree not listed below, please check the one which is most nearly equivalent to the one you hold.)

a. _____ No degree

b. _____ Degree based on less than four years of college

c. _____ Bachelor's degree

d. _____ Teaching credential

e. _____ Master's degree

f. _____ Educational specialist

g. _____ Doctoral degree

12. Please check the teachers' organization (s) to which you belong, if any.

a. _____ California Teachers Association (branch of the National Education Association.)

b. _____ American Federation of Teachers

c. _____ Other (Please write in): _____

d. _____ None

13. What do you think you will be doing five years from now? (Please check only one.)

a. _____ Teaching in the same school or school system, same job.

b. _____ Teaching in the same school or school system, different job.

c. _____ Doing administrative work in the same school or school system.

d. _____ Teaching in a different school or school system, same job.

e. _____ Teaching in a different school or school system, different job.

f. _____ Doing administrative work in a different school or school system.

g. _____ Teaching part-time.

h. _____ In another kind of work. (Business?)
What kind of work? (Please write in): _____

i. _____ Not working.

j. _____ I have no idea what I will be doing five years from now.

k. _____ Returning full time to university for more education.

Note: If you checked "k" above will you probably... (Check one)

l. _____ Return to teaching?

m. _____ Return to administration?

n. _____ Not return to education?

14. How often do you find time to read professional literature specifically related to education?

Very Frequently	Frequently	Fairly Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Almost Never	Never

The role of the teacher is very complex. So that we may gain a clearer insight into the organization of the teacher's work, we would like information from you about the "tasks" that you perform. In order to get this information, we have divided your tasks into four major areas. It is terribly difficult to separate tasks which overlap, but we are sure that you will do your best.

1. Teaching Subject Matter: Including, for example, leading and participating in discussions; preparing lesson plans; stimulating student interest in learning; lecturing; acting as a guide and/or facilitator in student learning activities; examining and grading students on their knowledge of subject matter.

2. Teaching and/or stimulating citizenship, socialization and character development (abbreviated as Character Development): Including, for example, social skills; guiding the student toward or providing an environment where student and staff understanding of themselves and each other can develop; manners; morality; helping the individual develop his full human potential; interpersonal relations.

3. Maintaining Control: Including, for example, preventing interference with other classes; keeping down the noise level; helping students find ways of achieving individual freedom without placing restrictions on the freedom of others; keeping the attention of the class on their work; helping students work out for themselves the consequences their actions hold for others.

4. Record Keeping: Including, for example, reporting absences and/or late-comers; maintaining administrative records; turning in grades accurately and on time; fulfilling record keeping tasks required by state laws; taking attendance; setting up a system that attempts to measure the growth of student potential.

15. How important to you are each of these tasks? (Please check the appropriate square for each task.)

	Extremely Important	Very Important	Moderately Important	Slightly Important	Not At All Important
Teaching Subj. Matter					
Character Development					
Maintaining Control					
Record Keeping					

18. Under present arrangements, how much freedom do you have to determine how each task is done?

	You have a great deal of freedom.	You have considerable freedom.	You have some freedom.	You have little freedom.	You have no freedom.
Teaching Subj. Matter					
Character Development					
Maintaining Control					
Record Keeping					

19. In this school, how much freedom should you have to determine how each task is done?

	You should have a great deal of freedom.	You should have considerable freedom.	You should have some freedom.	You should have little freedom.	You should have no freedom.
Teaching Subj. Matter					
Character Development					
Maintaining Control					
Record Keeping					

16. Think of the way each task is organized in this school. In general, which of the following best describes the way you usually do each task?

	There is a standard operating procedure you are supposed to follow.	Someone tells you how to do the task.	You consult with others and decide together the way the task will be done.	You consult with others and then you decide how to do the task.	You alone decide the way the task will be done.
Teaching Subj. Matter					
Character Development					
Maintaining Control					
Record Keeping					

17. Think of the way you believe each task should be organized. In general, which of the following best describes the way you should usually do each task?

	There should be a standard operating procedure you are supposed to follow.	Someone should tell you how to do the task.	You should consult with others and decide together the way the task will be done.	You should consult with others and then you decide how to do the task.	You alone should decide the way the task will be done.
Teaching Subj. Matter					
Character Development					
Maintaining Control					
Record Keeping					

Now we want to ask you some questions about how often you receive ratings or evaluations: For example, an evaluator may compliment you on your good work each day or criticize you for mistakes; you may occasionally receive formal written evaluations; an evaluator may simply indicate his judgments of your performance with a smile or a frown; an evaluator may look at how you are doing and say nothing, yet you may know whether or not he is satisfied.

In general, when you learn in <u>any</u> way,-directly or indirectly, how well or poorly an evaluator thinks you are doing on a task, you are receiving an evaluation. Please remember that what we mean by evaluations includes much more than formal written evaluations.

20. How frequently do you learn your <u>principal's</u> evaluations of how well or poorly you are doing on each task?

	Very Frequently	Frequently	Fairly Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Almost Never	Never
Teaching Subj. Matter							
Character Development							
Maintaining Control							
Record Keeping							

21. How frequently do you learn other teachers' evaluations of how well or poorly you are doing on each task?

	Very Frequently	Frequently	Fairly Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Almost Never	Never
Teaching Subj. Matter							
Character Development							
Maintaining Control							
Record Keeping							

22. How frequently do you learn students' evaluations of how well or poorly you are doing on each task?

	Very Frequently	Frequently	Fairly Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Almost Never	Never
Teaching Subj. Matter							
Character Development							
Maintaining Control							
Record Keeping							

You may care very much about evaluations from some persons while the evaluations of others, for various reasons, may not be important to you.

23. How important to you are the evaluations of each of the following persons?

	Extremely Important	Very Important	Moderately Important	Slightly Important	Not At All Important	Not Applicable
Superintendent or Asst. Superintendent						
Principal or Asst. Principal						
Dept. Chairman or Dist. Supervisor						
Individual Teachers						
Members of your teaching team						
The faculty of your department						
The faculty of your school						
Teachers of the same subject or grade in other schools						
Volunteer Aides						
Parents						
Students						

24. For each task, how important to you is the evaluation of your principal?

	Extremely Important	Very Important	Moderately Important	Slightly Important	Not At All Important
Teaching Subj. Matter					
Character Development					
Maintaining Control					
Record Keeping					

25. For each task, how important to you is the evaluation of other teachers?

	Extremely Important	Very Important	Moderately Important	Slightly Important	Not At All Important
Teaching Subj. Matter					
Character Development					
Maintaining Control					
Record Keeping					

26. For each task, how important to you is the evaluation of students?

	Extremely Important	Very Important	Moderately Important	Slightly Important	Not At All Important
Teaching Subj. Matter					
Character Development					
Maintaining Control					
Record Keeping					

27. How often do you learn in <u>any</u> way, directly or indirectly, that your <u>principal</u> is dissatisfied with how well you are doing on each task or any part of it?

	Always	Almost Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Occa-sionally	Seldom	Almost Never	Never
Teaching Subj. Matter								
Character Development								
Maintaining Control								
Record Keeping								

28. How often do you learn in <u>any</u> way, directly or indirectly, that <u>other teachers</u> are dissatisfied with how well you are doing on each task or any part of it?

	Always	Almost Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Occa-sionally	Seldom	Almost Never	Never
Teaching Subj. Matter								
Character Development								
Maintaining Control								
Record Keeping								

29. How often do you learn in <u>any</u> way, directly or indirectly, that <u>students</u> are dissatisfied with how well you are doing on each task or any part of it?

	Always	Almost Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Occa-sionally	Seldom	Almost Never	Never
Teaching Subj. Matter								
Character Development								
Maintaining Control								
Record Keeping								

Consider the way tasks are given to you to do, the way standards are set, and the way information is collected for your evaluation by all those who evaluate you, either formally of informally, and the general manner in which evaluations are made.

30. In general, considering all these things together, how satisfied are you with the way your work is evaluated for each task?

	Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	Slightly Satisfied	Not At All Satisfied
Teaching Subj. Matter					
Character Development					
Maintaining Control					
Record Keeping					

31. How frequently do you tell others in the school, publicly or privately, that you are dissatisfied with the way each task is evaluated?

	Very Frequently	Frequently	Fairly Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Almost Never	Never
Teaching Subj. Matter							
Character Development							
Maintaining Control							
Record Keeping							

32. For each task, how frequently do you suggest changes in the school because you are dissatisfied with the way a certain task is evaluated?

	Very Frequently	Frequently	Fairly Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Almost Never	Never
Teaching Subj. Matter							
Character Development							
Maintaining Control							
Record Keeping							

33. For each task, how frequently do you decide not to do all or part of what you are told, or decide to delay doing it?

	Very Frequently	Frequently	Fairly Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Almost Never	Never
Teaching Subj. Matter							
Character Development							
Maintaining Control							
Record Keeping							

34. How frequently do you prevent information from being obtained on how you are doing on each task or any part of it?

	Very Frequently	Frequently	Fairly Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Almost Never	Never
Teaching Subj. Matter							
Chrarcter Development							
Maintaining Control							
Record Keeping							

35. How vague or undefined do your goals for each task appear to you?

	Extremely Vague	Very Vague	Moderately Vague	Slightly Vague	Not At All Vague
Teaching Subj. Matter					
Character Development					
Maintaining Control					
Record Keeping					

36. For each of your tasks, how vague or undefined do the goals of an average teacher in your subject area appear to you?

	Extremely Vague	Very Vague	Moderately Vague	Slightly Vague	Not At All Vague
Teaching Subj. Matter					
Character Development					
Maintaining Control					
Record Keeping					

37. For each task, how often are you successful in reaching your goals?

	Always	Almost Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Occa-sionally	Seldom	Almost Never	Never
Teaching Subj. Matter								
Character Development								
Maintaining Control								
Record Keeping								

38. If an intelligent layman (a bright individual without formal training in education) were to perform your tasks and try to reach your goals, how often would he be successful for each task?

	Always	Almost Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Occa-sionally	Seldom	Almost Never	Never
Teaching Subj. Matter								
Character Development								
Maintaining Control								
Record Keeping								

39. If an average teacher in your subject area were to perform your tasks and try to reach your goals, how often would he be successful for each task?

	Always	Almost Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Occa-sionally	Seldom	Almost Never	Never
Teaching Subj. Matter								
Character Development								
Maintaining Control								
Record Keeping								

40. If your principal were to perform your tasks and try to reach your goals, how often would he be successful for each task?

	Always	Almost Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Occa-sionally	Seldom	Almost Never	Never
Teaching Subj. Matter								
Character Development								
Maintaining Control								
Record Keeping								

For each task you perform, you are often faced with alternative ways of doing the task or some part of it.

41. For each task, how often can you predict which way of doing things is most likely to reach your goals?

	Always	Almost Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Occa-sionally	Seldom	Almost Never	Never
Teaching Subj. Matter								
Character Development								
Maintaining Control								
Record Keeping								

42. For each task you perform, how often do you think your <u>principal</u> could predict which way of doing things is most likely to reach your goals?

	Always	Almost Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Occa-sionally	Seldom	Almost Never	Never
Teaching Subj. Matter								
Character Development								
Maintaining Control								
Record Keeping								

43. For each task you perform, how often do you think an <u>average teacher</u> in your subject area could predict which way of doing things is most likely to reach your goals?

	Always	Almost Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Almost Never	Never
Teaching Subj. Matter								
Character Development								
Maintaining Control								
Record Keeping								

44. For each task you perform, how often do you think an <u>intelligent layman</u> (a bright individual without formal training in education) could predict which way of doing things is most likely to reach your goals?

	Always	Almost Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Almost Never	Never
Teaching Subj. Matter								
Character Development								
Maintaining Control								
Record Keeping								

45. How often, as a result of insufficient knowledge in the field of education, are you unable to predict which way of doing things is most likely to reach your goals for each task?

	Always	Almost Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Almost Never	Never
Teaching Subj. Matter								
Character Development								
Maintaining Control								
Record Keeping								

46. On the average, for each task you perform, how soundly based are your principal's evaluations of your performance?

	Extremely Soundly Based	Very Soundly Based	Moderately Soundly Based	Slightly Soundly Based	Not At All Soundly Based
Teaching Subj. Matter					
Character Development					
Maintaining Control					
Record Keeping					

47. On the average, for each task you perform, how soundly based are other teachers' evaluations of your performance?

	Extremely Soundly Based	Very Soundly Based	Moderately Soundly Based	Slightly Soundly Based	Not At All Soundly Based
Teaching Subj. Matter					
Character Development					
Maintaining Control					
Record Keeping					

47a. On the average, for each task you perform, how soundly based are parents' evaluations of your performance?

	Extremely Soundly Based	Very Soundly Based	Moderately Soundly Based	Slightly Soundly Based	Not At Ali Soundly Based
Teaching Subj. Matter					
Character Development					
Maintaining Control					
Record Keeping					

48. On the average, for each task you perform, how soundly based are students' evaluations of your performance?

	Extremely Soundly Based	Very Soundly Based	Moderately Soundly Based	Slightly Soundly Based	Not At All Soundly Based
Teaching Subj. Matter					
Character Development					
Maintaining Control					
Record Keeping					

Teaching tasks may be said to have essentially two components: 1. a procedure or performance activity (ies), and, 2. an outcome (s) or set of results.

49. On the average, for each task you perform, how frequently do you think students observe aspects of your task performance?

	Very Frequently	Frequently	Fairly Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Almost Never	Never
Teaching Subj. Matter							
Character Development							
Maintaining Control							
Record Keeping							

50. On the average, for each task you perform, how frequently do you think your principal observes aspects of your task performance?

	Very Frequently	Frequently	Fairly Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Almost Never	Never
Teaching Subj. Matter							
Character Development							
Maintaining Control							
Record Keeping							

51. On the average, for each task you perform, how frequently do you think other teachers observe aspects of your task performance?

	Very Frequently	Frequently	Fairly Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Almost Never	Never
Teaching Subj. Matter							
Character Development							
Maintaining Control							
Record Keeping							

52. On the average, for each task you perform, how frequently do you think students observe the outcome of your performance?

	Very Frequently	Frequently	Fairly Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Almost Never	Never
Teaching Subj. Matter							
Character Development							
Maintaining Control							
Record Keeping							

53. On the average, for each task you perform, how frequently do you think your principal observes the outcome of your performance?

	Very Frequently	Frequently	Fairly Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Almost Never	Never
Teaching Subj. Matter							
Character Development							
Maintaining Control							
Record Keeping							

54. On the average, for each task you perform, how frequently do you think other teachers observe the outcome of your performance?

	Very Frequently	Frequently	Fairly Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Almost Never	Never
Teaching Subj. Matter							
Character Development							
Maintaining Control							
Record Keeping							

55. On the average, for each of these tasks, what proportion of your performance is observed by students?

	A Great Deal Of Your Performance	A Considerable Proportion Of Your Performance	Some Of Your Performance	Little Of Your Performance	None Of Your Performance
Teaching Subj. Matter					
Character Development					
Maintaining Control					
Record Keeping					

56. On the average, for each of these tasks, what proportion of your performance is observed by your principal?

	A Great Deal Of Your Performance	A Considerable Proportion Of Your Performance	Some Of Your Performance	Little Of Your Performance	None Of Your Performance
Teaching Subj. Matter					
Character Development					
Maintaining Control					
Record Keeping					

57. On the average, for each of these tasks, what proportion of your performance is observed by other teachers?

	A Great Deal Of Your Performance	A Considerable Proportion Of Your Performance	Some Of Your Performance	Little Of Your Performance	None Of Your Performance
Teaching Subj. Matter					
Character Development					
Maintaining Control					
Record Keeping					

58. On the average, for each of these tasks, what proportion of the outcomes of your performances is observed by students?

	A Great Many Of The Outcomes	A Considerable Number Of The Outcomes	Some Of The Outcomes	Little Of The Outcomes	None Of The Outcomes
Teaching Subj. Matter					
Character Development					
Maintaining Control					
Record Keeping					

59. On the average, for each of these tasks, what proportion of the outcomes of your performances is observed by your principal?

	A Great Many Of The Outcomes	A Considerable Number Of The Outcomes	Some Of The Outcomes	Little Of The Outcomes	None Of The Outcomes
Teaching Subj. Matter					
Character Development					
Maintaining Control					
Record Keeping					

60. On the average, for each of these tasks, what proportion of the outcomes of your performances is observed by other teachers?

	A Great Many Of The Outcomes	A Considerable Number Of The Outcomes	Some Of The Outcomes	Little Of The Outcomes	None Of The Outcomes
Teaching Subj. Matter					
Character Development					
Maintaining Control					
Record Keeping					

There may be many people who occasionally or frequently evaluate how well or poorly you are doing on these tasks. Although many people may judge your work, perhaps not all of them have influence on your organizational rewards and penalties.

The term, organizational rewards and penalties, includes many things: For example, class assignments: room assignments; pay for extra services; tenure; scheduling preferences; salary; assignment of assistants; leaves of absence; access to equipment; being retained in service of the school, etc.

61. How important to you are the organizational rewards and penalties which your school offers?

Extremely Important	Very Important	Moderately Important	Slightly Important	Not At All Important

62. How much influence does each of the persons listed below have on your organizational rewards and penalties?

	Extremely Influential	Very Influential	Moderately Influential	Slightly Influential	Not At All Influential	Not Applicable
Superintendent or Asst. Superintendent						
Principal or Asst. Principal						
Dept. Chairman or Dist. Supervisor						
Individual Teachers						
Members of your teaching team						
The faculty of your department						
The faculty of your school						
Teachers of the same subject or grade in other schools						
Volunteer Aides						
Parents						
Students						

63. How much influence <u>should</u> each of the persons listed below have on your organizational rewards and penalties?

	Extremely Influential	Very Influential	Moderately Influential	Slightly Influential	Not At All Influential	Not Applicable
Superintendent or Asst. Superintendent						
Principal or Asst. Principal						
Dept. Chairman or Dist. Supervisor						
Individual Teachers						
Members of your teaching team						
The faculty of your department						
The faculty of your school						
Teachers of the same subject or grade in other schools						
Volunteer Aides						
Parents						
Students						

Evaluations of tasks may differ in their influence upon organizational rewards and penalties. The evaluation of one task may influence your rewards greatly, while the evaluation of other tasks may have no influence.

64. How much influence do evaluations of your performance on each task have on your organizational rewards and penalties?

	Extremely Influential	Very Influential	Moderately Influential	Slightly Influential	Not At All Influential
Teaching Subj. Matter					
Character Development					
Maintaining Control					
Record Keeping					

65. How much influence <u>should</u> evaluations of your performance on each task have on your organizational rewards and penalties?

	Extremely Influential	Very Influential	Moderately Influential	Slightly Influential	Not At All Influential
Teaching Subj. Matter					
Character Development					
Maintaining Control					
Record Keeping					

66. This year, how good is the educational background of most of your students?
    a. _____ Excellent
    b. _____ Very good
    c. _____ Good
    d. _____ Fair
    e. _____ Poor

67. The intrinsic satisfactions of a teaching career far outweigh the monetary or other extrinsic rewards I receive.
    a. _____ Strongly agree
    b. _____ Agree
    c. _____ Neutral or no opinion
    d. _____ Disagree
    e. _____ Strongly disagree

68. In general, the personality charactistics of the teacher are more important in determining success in teaching than any particular knowledge or set of skills the teacher possesses.
    a. _____ Strongly agree
    b. _____ Agree
    c. _____ Neutral or no opinion
    d. _____ Disagree
    e. _____ Strongly disagree

69. How helpful is your formal teacher training (including practice teaching) in enabling you to carry out your work?
    a. _____ Extremely helpful
    b. _____ Very helpful
    c. _____ Moderately helpful
    d. _____ Slightly helpful
    e. _____ Not at all helpful

70. How helpful is your work experience in teaching (since finishing your training) in enabling you to carry out your work?
    a. _____ Extremely helpful
    b. _____ Very helpful
    c. _____ Moderately helpful
    d. _____ Slightly helpful
    e. _____ Not at all helpful

71. In general, what ability group of students do you teach most this year?
    a. _____ The most intelligent students in this school.
    b. _____ Above average students in this school.
    c. _____ Average students in this school.
    d. _____ Below average students in this school.
    e. _____ The least intelligent students in this school.
    f. _____ It is hard to say since I teach a combination of these ability groups.

72. How much personal satisfaction do you receive from your vocation as a teacher?
    a. _____ A great deal of satisfaction
    b. _____ Considerable satisfaction
    c. _____ Some satisfaction
    d. _____ Little satisfaction
    e. _____ No satisfaction

73. What are some of your major sources of satisfaction in teaching in this school and school district?

_____

_____

_____

74. What changes would most increase your satisfaction as a teacher in this school and school district?

_____

_____

_____